

Remarks

The applicant elects to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10 and 22-30. The applicant withdraws claims 11-21 and 31-37 from consideration.

The specification is objected to because there is no summary. Since no summary is required, no summary will be included.

Claims 1-10 and 22-30 are at issue. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fedorov et al. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen and further in view of Shen. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen and further in view of Shen and further in view of Herrero Garcia et al. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen and further in view of Laborde. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen and further in view of Feinberg. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorov in view of Mizikovsky. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorov in view of Mizikovsky and further in view of Laborde. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorov in view of Mizikovsky and further in view of Laborde and further in view of Feinberg. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorov in view of Mizikovsky and further in view of Laborde and further in view of Feinberg and further in view of Rahikainen. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Rahikainen in view of Mizikovsky and further in view of Laborde and further in view of Feinberg.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Rahikainen. Claim 1 requires a transceiver capable of establishing a wireless local loop connection; a voice processing system coupled to the transceiver, the voice processing system capable of storing a message from an incoming call; a voice bridge; and a caller identification processing system coupled to the transceiver, the caller identification processing system determining a telephone number of the incoming call and routing the incoming call to the voice processing system if the telephone number belongs to a screened group of telephone numbers. The purpose of the voice bridge is to setup 3-way or conference calls (page 9, lines 25-26 and page 14, lines 5-10). Neither Mizikovsky nor Rahikainen discloses a voice bridge. Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-10 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fedorov et al. Claim 22 requires a switch connected to an external telephony channel and an internal telephony channel; a processor connected to the switch, the processor sending and receiving messages from the switch; a voice bridge connected to the switch; and a caller identification system receiving an identify query from the processor. The purpose of the voice bridge is to setup 3-way or conference calls (page 9, lines 25-26 and page 14, lines 5-10). Fedorov discloses no voice bridge. Claim 22 is allowable.


Claims 23-30 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Bennett et al.)

By



Attorney for the Applicant

Dale B. Halling


Phone: (719) 447-1990

Fax: (719) 447-0983

I hereby certify that an Amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on:

22 SEP 00

Date



Signature (Timothy M. Barlow)